REMARKS

The Specification has been amended. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Claims 22 - 32 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 2 - 17 and 19 - 21 are cancelled from the application without prejudice. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims that were amended and the cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the claim amendments and cancellations are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the now-cancelled claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Claims 1, 18, and 22 - 32 are now in the application.

I.   Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph

Page 3 of the Office Action dated April 18, 2007 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the word "operable" is considered problematic on line 3. Appropriate amendments are provided herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

II.   Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §101

Page 3 of the Office Action further states that Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the

amendments provided herein resolve the Examiner's concern, and accordingly, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to withdraw this §101 rejection.

III.   Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(e)

Page 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,804,714 to Tummalapalli (hereinafter,

"Tummalapalli"). This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the claims as currently

presented.

Independent Claim 1, as currently presented, specifies:

> A method of using geospatial operations of a geospatially-enabled
> database system to analyze a service level management system ("SLMS"),
> comprising:
>   collecting, from each of a plurality of probes, a plurality of
> measurements pertaining to a plurality of service offerings of the SLMS,
> wherein each of the service offerings comprises a plurality of collaborations
> among processes of the SLMS, each of the collaborations comprises a plurality
> of key process indicators representing the processes of the SLMS, each of the
> key process indicators represents at least one of the processes of the SLMS,
> and each one of the probes is associated with a different one of the key process
> indicators;
>   programmatically constructing a geospatial cube from the collected
> measurements, wherein:
>   a first dimension of the geospatial cube comprises a first
> collection of planes, each of the planes in the first collection representing, for
> each of the service offerings of the SLMS and a particular time from among a

plurality of times at which the measurements were collected, a service offering metric computed from the measurements collected at the particular time;

a second dimension of the geospatial cube comprises a second collection of planes, each of the planes in the second collection representing, for each of the service offerings of the SLMS and a particular value of the service offering metric, each of the plurality of times at which the measurements were collected and at which the particular value occurred for that service offering; and

a third dimension of the geospatial cube comprises a third collection of planes, each of the planes in the third collection representing, for each of the plurality of times at which the measurements were collected and a particular one of the service offerings of the SLMS, the service offering metric computed from the measurements collected at that time for the particular one of the service offerings; and

analyzing the processes of the SLMS by using the constructed cube as input to geospatial operations provided by the geospatially-enabled database system. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Tummalapali fails to teach, or suggest, (at least) the above-underlined limitations from independent Claim 1. Independent Claims 18 and 27 specify analogous limitations to those of Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 18, and 27 are deemed patentable over Tummalapali. Dependent Claims 22 - 26 and 28 - 32 are deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of the independent claims from which they depend. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of all claims as currently presented.

IV.   Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/   /#40,999/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587